DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 591 CS 505 227

AUTHOR Miller, Dianna K.
TITLE The Relationship between Childhood Television Viewing Habits and Adult Viewing Behaviors.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, February 15-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Attitudes; Childhood Attitudes; Children; Comparative Analysis; *Habit Formation; Higher Education; Secondary Education; *Television Research; *Television Viewing; *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

A study examined whether a relationship exists between childhood viewing habits and adult viewing behaviors. Questionnaires on childhood and adult viewing behaviors were completed by 557 students in a basic public speaking course, 86 residents of a university family housing unit, 74 vocational students, and 23 members of the local Jaycees organization. Presence of television in the childhood home was compared with presence of television in the adult home and with four of the five adult variables (excluding types): time spent viewing, types of programs watched, general interest levels, television viewing philosophy, and viewing companions. Each of four of the five childhood variables (excluding types) was compared with each of four of the five adult variables (excluding types) and also with presence of television in the adult home. The overall findings indicated that, in many ways, childhood viewing habits are related to adult viewing behavior. The relationship between childhood habits and adult behaviors appears to be especially strong and interrelated in the areas of number of hours spent watching television, general interest level, television viewing philosophy, and types of programs preferred. The results put into question the uses and gratifications argument that people actively view to gratify needs. (Tables of data are included.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED268591

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHILDHOOD TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND ADULT VIEWING BEHAVIORS

BY DIANNA K. MILLER
Speech Communication Department
Colorado State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dianna Kay Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS505327

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHILDHOOD TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND ADULT VIEWING BEHAVIORS

This study sought to determine if a relationship existed between childhood television viewing habits and adult viewing behaviors. Questionnaires were administered to students enrolled in the basic public speaking courses at Colorado State University, residents of a CSU family housing unit, students at Larimer County Voc-Tech and members of the Fort Collins Jaycees.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program, CROSSTABS and Contingency Table Analysis were used to analyze the data.

The results indicate that there is a strong relationship between childhood viewing habits and adult viewing behaviors in many areas. This study was an initial probe into the area of television viewing habits. The results indicate that more in-depth research into this area is warranted.

1

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHILDHOOD TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND ADULT VIEWING BEHAVIORS

Why do people watch what they do on television? The answer to this question is sought with vigor by the broadcast industry. Traditionally, the industry used (and still uses) demographic analysis to find the answer. Whose television set is on, and when, is ascertained mainly through the use of viewing diaries filled out by audience members, and audimeters (electronic devices hooked to audience members' television sets that keep a record of when the set is on and what channel it is tuned to) placed in selected homes. This traditional demographic analysis or "head counting" used by the industry can supply only limited information about viewers and their needs and tastes. Cheney (1980) outlines the shortcomings of traditional audience analysis:

> The first objection is that the audience is reported as a "fictitious average." . . . The second objection has been described as "minority skew." This term explains that demographic data may be indistinguishable for the particular programs. . . . The third objection is that the picture one has of the audience offers no insight into why one particular group watches a particular program and another group does not. . . . The fourth objection . . . is the tendency of demographic analysis to treat particular combinations of demographic data as a homogenous group (p. 27).

Melvin Goldberg, Vice-President of Technology Research for ABC, speaks of the industry's need to go beyond demographics. More specific information is needed concerning such things as

audience beliefs and attitudes, as well as education and economics. "We want to know why two people with the same income, education, and demographic characteristics watch different programs" (Smith, 1983, p. 126).

The broadcast industry has attempted to meet this need with lifestyle and psychographic research. Such research involves developing psychological profiles of audiences and psychological based measures of lifestyles (Wells, 1974, p. v). Les Brown (1976), Radio and Television Editor of the New York Times, says the networks especially are becoming increasingly involved with research such as this in an attempt to ascertain why people watch what they watch.

Scholarly research has also addressed the question of why people watch what they do on television. Perhaps the most popular approach used by researchers in this area is referred to as uses and gratifications research. According to Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch (1974), uses and gratifications research is concerned with social and psychological needs of the audience, how these need originate, and how audience members use mass media to gratify these needs. Uses and gratifications researchers use many different approaches. For instance, some research begins with a list of possible needs and tries to discover whether or not subjects gratify these needs with the media. Other research begins with gratifications and tries to discover

the needs behind them. Whatever approach is used, the emphasis in uses and gratifications research is on the audience, rather than technology, ideology, or aesthetics (pp. 20-21).

Uses and gratifications research rests on five basic assumptions, according to Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch:

> (1) The audience is conceived of as active, that is, an important part of the mass media use is assumed to be goal directed. . . . (2) In the mass communication process much initiative in linking need gratification and media choice lies with the audience member. This places a strong limitation on theorizing about any form of straight-line effect of media content on attitudes and behavior. . . . (3) The media compete with other sources of need satisfaction. . . . Consequently, a proper view of the role of the media in need satisfaction should take into account other functional alternatives. . . . (4) Methodically speaking, many of the goals of mass media use can be derived from data supplied by individual audience members themselves--that is, people are sufficiently self-aware to be able to report their interests and motives in particular cases, or at least to recognize them when confronted with them in an intelligible and familiar verbal formulation. (5) Value judgments about the cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended while audience orientations are explored on their own terms (pp. 21-22).

One of the major criticisms of uses and gratifications is that one of its underpinning theoretical assumptions, that audiences are active rather than passive consumers of media, is flawed. Davison, Boylan, and Yu (1976) argue that.

> Support for the idea that there is a large passive audience comes from the television ratings, which show that the total television audience is fairly constant at given times of the day and night. People who like to watch at a certain hour will find

> something to watch regardless of what is being shown (pp. 148-49).

Bogart (1965), while studying television in the lives of blue-collar workers, found that people watch television to pass time. Their program choice "often reflects chance circumstances within the range of availabilities rather than the expression of psychological motivation or need" (p. 428). Charren and Sandler (1983) dedicate an entire book to criticizing the passive way in which Americans view television, and offer advice on how to change viewing behaviors. Elliott questions "whether mass communication research has really provided the evidence for an active audience" (p. 254). He points out that the old stimulus-response models which assumed the audience to be passive were discarded "more because the assumption they made of an atomized, individual audience was shown to be false, than because evidence accumulated showing the audience was especially active or purposive in its media behavior" (p. 254).

One uses and gratifications researcher to address this criticism is Rubin (1984). Rubin says that "audience activity is not an absolute concept, but a variable one" (p. 76). In his research, Rubin found two types of television use: "ritualized," described as "habitual, frequent and indicating a high regard for television as a medium," and "instrumental," described as "purposeful, selective and goal directed, without

being frequent or indicating a high regard for the importance of the medium" (p. 75). According to Rubin, in general, viewers fall into one category or the other, but it is also common for an individual viewer to display both types of viewing behavior at different times. Rubin admits that a ritualized audience is not an active audience in terms of intentionality or selectivity, but only in terms of utility. He proposes, then to broaden the concept of the active audience to "encompass more than specifying decisions about whether and what to watch" (p. 77).

Rubin is the first uses and gratifications researcher to give more than a passing mention to the idea of habitual television use. Habit is an established motivation for television usage in uses and gratifications literature, but it is never more than quickly or superficially mentioned. Greenberg refers to habit as "a catch-all category, useful in lumping a group of less specific reasons for watching television" (p. 74). Rubin (1984) discusses the concept of habit more fully, but never really comes to grips with its paradoxical position in uses and gratifications research. If habit is a valid motivation for television viewing, the uses and gratifications position is severely weakened. One of the most important theoretical principles in uses and gratifications research is that television audiences are active, purposefully using the medium to gratify

their social and psychological needs. This concept of an active audience, one that ascertains its needs and knows specifically where to turn in the media to satisfy those needs, one that controls media rather than allowing media to control it, is in direct contrast to the concept of an audience who watches television out of habit. A habitual audience member probably turns on the set automatically, without conscious consideration or forethought, simply because such behavior has become an ingrained pattern. Rubin (1977) concedes that "habitual viewing may not fit neatly within a uses and gratifications paradigm whose theoretical foundation is built upon the assumption of purposeful viewing. Further investigations may want to consider this supposition" (p. 368).

Uses and gratifications' treatment of the concept of habit is not only paradoxical, it is also simply insufficient. It is not enough to maintain that one reason people view television is because of habit. More information is needed to adequately understand the concept of habitual television use. It is necessary to ask when and how these habits are developed and to what extent they actually influence television viewing behavior.

Scholarly research would benefit from a study of television viewing habits, particularly uses and gratifications research. If habit is a strong, valid motivation for people watching

what they do on television, some of the basic premises of the uses and gratifications approach may need to be reexamined and the whole theory either revamped or discarded. Without an exploration into the area of habits, uses and gratifications research will continue to harbor the paradox of, on the one hand, maintaining audiences are active viewers, and that, on the other hand, people may view television out of habit. As such, it is flawed research, and should not be relied upon to provide an answer to the question of why people watch what they do on television.

Another important reason for an initial probe into the area of habitual television viewing is that the results may provide the beginnings of a whole new area of research. If it is established that previously acquired habits affect a person's television viewing behavior, many questions follow. When were these habits established? What causes a person to acquire them? How strongly do they affect viewing behaviors?

One possibility is that television viewing behaviors, like so many other behaviors, are learned as children and carried into adulthood. Because the first generation of people exposed to television since birth is coming of age, now is an appropriate time to ask how television has influenced them. Does a lifetime of viewing affect television consumption?

Do the viewing habits learned as a child affect present viewing behaviors?

Because the area of habitual television use is potentially such a large one, this study limited itself to the possible relationship between childhood viewing habits and adult viewing behaviors by attempting to answer the following research question:

> What is the relationship of childhood television viewing habits to the viewing behaviors of adults?

METHOD

This study utilized a questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaire was constructed in two parts. Part one dealt with childhood viewing habits and part two ascertained adult viewing behavior. Since there had been no previous research into the area of habits, no instrument was available to be used; consequently, the questionnaire was constructed by the researcher. Studies by other researchers delving into audience viewing behaviors were reviewed to find what types of questions were usually asked in this area. Rubin has conducted research in the area of television viewing behaviors (1982, 1983, 1984) and has developed questions inquiring into three viewing areas: amount of time spent watching television, types of programs watched, and affinity for television. These three areas were used as starting points for constructing the questionnaire used in the present study. The notion of "affinity"

for television was broken down into two parts--television viewing philosophy and interest level in television. An additional area ascertaining with whom the subject usually viewed television, was added. The resulting instrument, then, was designed to explore the following five areas of television viewing: amount of time spent watching television, types of television programs preferred, television viewing philosophy, interest level in television, and television viewing companions. Additional questions, ascertaining presence of television in the childhood and adult home, were added to control for this as a possible intervening variable. For the purposes of this study, the terms "viewing habits" and "viewing behaviors" were used interchangeably and were operationally defined in terms of the five areas cited above. These five areas were explored on the questionnaire in the following ways:

Amount of time spent watching television:

Subjects were asked to indicate in hours per day how much television they watched, both as a child and as an adult.

Types of programs watched:

Subjects were given a list of program types (i.e., situation comedies, dramas, variety shows, etc.) and asked to indicate which types they preferred to watch, both as a child and as an adult. The list contained 12 choices--in essence, Rubin's list with some minor modifications.

General interest level:

Subjects were asked to indicate their interest level in television on a four-point Likert scale ranging from "very" to "not at all," both as a child and as an adult.

Television viewing philosophy:

Subjects were given a list of viewing philosophies and asked to choose which one most closely resembled their parents' viewing philosophy regarding their television viewing as a child, and also their own adult viewing philosophy. The viewing philosophies presented to the subjects to choose from on the questionnaire were arranged from the most liberal or lenient viewing philosophy to the strictest. For instance, the childhood viewing philosophies list contained seven choices ranging from "I was allowed to view as much as I liked," which is a lenient viewing philosophy with little parental control, to "I was not allowed to view at all," which is a very strict, disciplined viewing philosophy. The adult viewing philosophy list contained thirteen choices, ranging from "I would rather watch television than participate in almost any other activity" (a very lenient, indiscriminate viewing philosophy), to "I don't view television at all" (a strict, self-disciplined philosophy). These two lists were based loosely on Rubin's questions ascertaining

affinity for television, but modified for the purposes of this study.

Television viewing companions:

Subjects were asked with whom (i.e., parents, friends, etc.), if anybody, they usually viewed television, both as a child and as an adult.

For the purposes of this study, only adult subjects aged 18-35 were used. Barnouw (1975) calls the years between 1948 and 1952 "a laboratory period" in television, when both audiences and advertisers began to see its vast potential (p. 113). The A. C. Nielson Company (1973) estimates that in January of 1954, 56% of American homes had television, as compared to only 9% in January of 1950. Obviously, television sets in the home became a common phenomenon during the early 50's. Consequently, only subjects who were 35 years old or younger (born after 1950) were used, since older subjects may be too old to have had television in their childhood home. Subjects who were under 18 years old were also not used, because it was assumed that the majority of them would still be living with their parents, and their television viewing may still have been under adult supervision.

In order to accommodate such an age group, and to get as wide a sample as possible of education and socio-economic status, four different groups of subjects were chosen: students

from basic speech courses at Colorado State University; residents of Aggie Village, one of the family housing facilities for CSU; Larimer County Voc-Tech students and Fort Collins Jaycees. In the cases of the basic course students, Voc-Tech students and Jaycees, questionnaires were administered during a class or club meeting. Subjects were read a list of instructions before filling out the questionnaire. In the case of the family housing students, questionnaires were distributed to each American household, along with written instructions and information on how to return the questionnaire to the researcher.

Of the original 900 questionnaires distributed, 557 usable questionnaires were returned: 374 from the basic course students, 86 from the family housing students, 74 from the vocational students, and 23 from the Jaycees.

In analyzing this data, single response questions (in essence, all but the questions ascertaining types of programs preferred) were calculated using the SPSS program CROSSTABS, to determine the relationship, if any, between the following variables: presence of television in the childhood home was compared with four of the five adult variables (excluding types) and also with presence of television in the adult home; each of four of the five childhood variables (excluding types) was compared with each of four of the five adult variables

(excluding types) and also with presence of television in the adult home. The CROSSTABS program statistic used was chi-square.

The multi-response questions involving types of programs preferred were subjected to contingency table analysis, comparing those who watched each type as a child to those who watched that same type as an adult. Again, the statistic used was chi-square.

RESULTS

The first statistical comparisons (using CROSSTABS) investigated the relationship between childhood and adult variables for all single response questions. Of 25 comparisons, 7 were found to be significant ($p = .05$ or less) and one approached significance ($p = .061$ or less).

The information in Table 1 shows that the presence of a television set in the childhood home (or lack of it) resulted in different adult viewing philosophies. Subjects who had no television in their childhood home were proportionately more likely to say they felt guilty when they watched "too much" television. Subjects who had a television set in their childhood home, however, were proportionately more likely to say either that they watched television when they had nothing else to do, or that they watched television whenever they had time. The viewing philosophies presented to the subjects to choose from

on the questionnaire were arranged from the most liberal or lenient viewing philosophy to the strictest. For instance, subjects who chose "I often watch television rather than doing my chores/homework" have a more lenient, less disciplined viewing philosophy than do those who choose "I only view programs I preselect for myself to watch." The results of this analysis, then, indicate that subjects who had a television set in their childhood home tended to have a more lenient adult viewing philosophy than those who did not have a television as a child.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 indicate that the number of hours spent watching television as a child is significantly related to the number of hours spent watching as an adult, to adult interest level, and to adult viewing philosophy. Chi-square analysis reflected significant differences among groups in all three areas. The patterns of the relationships indicate that, proportionately, subjects who spent the most hours (high category) watching television as a child spent the most amount of hours watching television as an adult. These subjects also tended to fall into the high interest level category and tended to mark, "I often watch television rather than doing my chores," which is a lenient viewing philosophy. Conversely, those who watched little television as a child (low category) proportionately watched little television as an adult, had a

low amount of interest in television as an adult, and tended to have a very strict viewing philosophy (I feel guilty when I watch "too much" television). The general tendency here seemed to be, the more as a child, the more as an adult.

Tables 5, 6 and 7 demonstrate much the same result as indicated above between interest level in television as a child and hours spent watching as an adult, adult interest level and adult viewing philosophy. Again, there was a significant difference among groups. Proportionately, subjects with a higher interest level as a child (high category) tended to spend the most hours watching television as an adult (high category), to be more interested in television as an adult (high category) and to have a more lenient adult viewing philosophy (I often watch television rather than doing my chores/homework). Subjects with little interest in television as a child (low category) proportionately watched less television as an adult (low category), displayed little interest in television as an adult (low category) and had a very disciplined adult viewing philosophy (I only view programs that I preselect for myself to watch). Once again, the tendency was the more as a child, the more as an adult.

The relationship between childhood television viewing companions and adult viewing companions approached significance (Table 8). Those who watched television alone as a child were

proportionately more likely to watch it alone as an adult. Interestingly enough, those who usually watched television with friends as a child were also proportionately more likely to watch alone as adults. However, subjects who viewed with their parents in their childhood home more often said they watched with friends as adults. This seems to indicate that watching under parental supervision as a child discourages solitary viewing as an adult.

The second statistical comparison examined the relationship between watching a type of program as a child and then later, as an adult. Contingency table analysis (see Table 9) revealed that of 12 types of shows explored, 9 showed a significant relationship between viewing that type as a child and then later as an adult (movies, talk shows and sports were not significantly related). These results indicate the probability that watching a particular type of show as a child becomes a habit that carries over into adult behavior.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship, if any, between childhood viewing habits and adult viewing behaviors. The results indicated a positive relationship in many areas of this study. The relationship between childhood and adult behaviors seems to be particularly strong and

interrelated in the areas of amount of time spent watching, interest level, and viewing philosophy. Types of programs preferred as a child and then later as an adult also showed an important interrelationship.

Results indicated the more hours watched and the more interested a subject was as a child, the more of both were present as an adult. Subjects who watched alone or with friends (i.e., without an adult present) were more likely to watch alone as an adult. Those who viewed with their parents as a child tended to watch with friends as an adult. The general pattern seems to be that subjects who had undisciplined viewing philosophies, watched a large number of hours of television, and usually viewed in unsupervised atmospheres as children, tended to repeat this pattern in adulthood. As adults, they had indiscriminate viewing philosophies, viewed large numbers of hours, and tended to view television alone.

Childhood areas (especially hours and interest) were not only related to the matching adult area, but also interrelated with other adult areas. Both childhood hours and childhood interest level were related positively to adult hours, interest level and philosophy, with the pattern being, generally, the more as a child, the more as an adult.

There was also a significant relationship between watching a particular type of show as a child and then later as an adult.

The overall findings of this study indicate that, in many ways, childhood viewing habits do relate to adult viewing behavior. The relationship between childhood habits and adult behaviors appears to be especially strong and interrelated in the areas of number of hours spent watching television, general interest level, television viewing philosophy and types of programs preferred.

The results of this study may have some serious implications for uses and gratifications research. If, as this present study indicates, viewing habits developed as a child play a part in determining what people view as adults, the uses and gratifications argument that people actively view to gratify needs is seriously weakened. Viewing from habit is a passive activity requiring little thought, in direct contrast to the uses and gratifications position.

On a more utilitarian level, another implication of the results found here is that parents who would like to see their children less involved with television as adults should start discouraging television viewing in general when their children are young.

The results of this research suggest that it would be worthwhile to delve deeper into the area of the effects of childhood viewing on adult viewing. Such studies would help clarify just where the notion of habit fits in uses and

gratifications research in particular, and mass media research in general.

One particular approach to take would be to sample smaller age groups, for instance, 18-21 year olds and 30 years and above to see if as one ages and progresses farther away from youth, the influence of childhood habits lessens. Also, one could compare different adult viewing areas to each other. For instance, is there a relationship between number of hours watched as an adult and adult viewing philosophy?

The area of habitual television use is virtually unexplored in mass media research. Future endeavors in this area may provide useful and much needed information that will help us answer the question of why people watch what they do on television.

REFERENCES

A. C. Nielsen Company (1973). Nielsen television '73. Chicago: A. C. Nielsen Co.

Barnouw, E. (1975). Tube of plenty: The evolution of American television. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bogart, L. (1965). The mass media and the blue-collar worker. In A. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), Blue-collar world: Studies of the American worker (pp. 416-28). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brown, L., & Phillips, D. D. (interview). (1976). Audience analysis (video tape recording No. E2059). Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University Instructional Services.

Charren, P., & Sandler, M. W. (1983). Changing channels. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cheney, M. R. (1980). What we really need from audience research and analysis. Public Telecommunications Review, 8, 25-30.

Davison, W. P., Boylan, J., & Yu, F. T. C. (1976). Mass media systems and effects. New York: Praeger.

Elliott, P. (1974). Uses and gratifications research: A critique and a sociological alternative. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research (pp. 249-68). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Greenberg, B. S. (1974). Gratifications of television viewing and their correlates for British children. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research (pp. 71-92). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual: An overview. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research (pp. 19-32). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lazer, W. (1974). Foreward. In W. D. Wells (Ed.), Life style and psychographics (pp. v-vi). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Rubin, A. M. (1977). Television usage, attitudes and viewing behavior of children and adolescents. Journal of Broadcasting, 23, 491-500.

Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interactions of viewing patterns and motivations. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 37-51.

Rubin, A. M. (1984). Ritualized and instrumental television viewing. Journal of Communication, 34, 67-77.

Rubin, A. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1982). Contextual age and television use. Human Communication Research, 8, 228-44.

Smith, J. R. (1983). Four perspectives on media research in the 1980s. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 185-90.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Did you have television in your childhood home (by the age of 5 or before)?

   yes _____(1) no _____ (2)

2. Do you presently have a TV in your home?

   yes _____ (1) no _____ (2)

3. Approximately how many hours of television a day did you watch as a child? (Check one)

   0 hrs _____ (1) 1-2 hrs _____ (2)
   3-4 hrs _____ (3) 5-6 hrs _____ (4)
   more _____ (5)

4. What kinds of programs did you watch as a child? (Check all types applicable)

   (1) situation comedies (humorous programs usually 1/2 hour long _____
   (2) police or detective shows _____
   (3) westerns _____
   (4) dramas (shows with serious themes usually 1 hour long) _____
   (5) TV movies (including cable) _____
   (6) talk shows _____
   (7) game shows _____
   (8) music/variety shows _____
   (9) soap operas (daytime or prime time) _____
   (10) sports _____
   (11) news _____
   (12) public TV _____
   (13) other (specify) _____

5. How interested in TV were you as a child? (Check one)

   very _____ (4) moderately _____ (3)
   not very _____ (2) not at all _____ (1)

6. Which of the following best describes the viewing philosophy of your parents concerning your television viewing as a child? (Check one)

   (1) _____ They allowed me to view as much as I liked.

(2) _____ They allowed me to view only after my chores and/or homework was completed.
(3) _____ They usually discouraged me from viewing (perhaps encouraging you to participate in other activities such as reading or playing with friends or siblings).
(4) _____ They only allowed me to view programs they pre-selected and approved.
(5) _____ They allowed me to view only a limited amount of TV (less than 7 hours a week).
(6) _____ They did not allow me to view television at all.
(7) _____ Other (specify) _____
_____

7. As a child, I usually watched television: (Check one most applicable)

(1) _____ alone
(2) _____ with friends or siblings
(3) _____ with parents

8. Approximately how many hours of television a day do you presently watch? (Check one)

0 hrs _____ (1) 1-2 hrs _____ (2)
3-4 hrs _____ (3) 5-6 hrs _____ (4)
more _____ (5)

9. How interested in television are you presently? (Check one)

very _____ (4) moderately _____ (3)
not very _____ (2) not at all _____ (1)

10. What kinds of programs do you presently prefer to watch? (Check all applicable)

(1) situation comedies (humorous programs usually 1/2 hour long) _____
(2) police or detective shows _____
(3) westerns _____
(4) dramas (shows with serious themes usually 1 hour long) _____
(5) TV movies (including cable) _____
(6) talk shows _____
(7) game shows _____
(8) music/variety shows _____
(9) soap operas (daytime or prime time) _____

(10) sports _____
(11) news _____
(12) public TV _____
(13) other (specify) _____

11. Which of the following best describes your present television viewing philosophy? (Check one)

(1) _____ I would rather watch TV than participate in almost any other activity (i.e., read, visit friends or relatives, attend parties, pursue hobbies, etc.).
(2) _____ I often watch TV rather than doing my chores/ homework.
(3) _____ I enjoy watching TV, and watch it whenever I have time.
(4) _____ I only watch TV after my chores/homework are done.
(5) _____ I only view TV when there is nothing else to to do (i.e. chores or social activities).
(6) _____ I feel guilty when I watch "too much" TV
(7) _____ I only view programs that I pre-select for myself to watch.
(8) _____ I don't view television at all.
(9) _____ Other (specify) _____
_____

12. Presently, I usually watch television: (Check one most applicable)

(1) _____ alone (2) _____ with friends or relatives

Table 1

Crosstabulation Table

Presence of TV in the Childhood Home by Adult Viewing Philosophy

	ADULT VIEWING PHILOSOPHY						
PRESENCE OF A TV	Before chores	When have time	After chores	Nothing else to do	Feel guilty	Preselect Programs	Row total
Yes	33	106	39	132	40	105	
ROW PCT	7.3	23.3	8.6	29.0	8.8	23.1	455
COL PCT	91.7	96.4	86.7	96.4	83.3	19.3	
No	3	4	6	5	8	10	
ROW PCT	8.3	11.1	16.7	13.9	22.2	27.8	36
COL PCT	8.3	3.6	13.3	3.6	16.7	8.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	36	110	45	137	48	115	N = 491

Chi-square = 13.854 with 5 degrees of freedom. p = .016

Table 2

Crosstabulation Table

Hours Spent Viewing as a Child by Hours Spent Viewing as an Adult

	HOURS AS AN ADULT			
HOURS AS A CHILD	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Low	182	27	3	
ROW PCT	85.8	12.7	1.4	212
COL PCT	44.2	23.9	13.0	
Medium	201	65	10	
ROW PCT	72.8	23.6	3.6	276
COL PCT	48.8	57.5	43.5	
High	29	21	10	
ROW PCT	48.3	35.0	16.7	60
COL PCT	7.0	18.6	43.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	412	113	23	N = 548

Chi-square = 49.076 with 4 degrees of freedom. p = .000

Table 3

Crosstabulation Table

Hours Spent Viewing as a Child by Adult Interest Level

	ADULT INTEREST LEVEL			
HOURS AS A CHILD	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Low	140	70	2	
ROW PCT	66.0	33.0	0.9	212
COL PCT	45.2	33.2	8.0	
Medium	142	118	14	
ROW PCT	51.8	43.1	5.1	274
COL PCT	45.8	55.9	56.0	
High	28	23	9	
ROW PCT	46.7	38.3	15.0	60
COL PCT	9.0	10.9	36.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	310	211	25	N = 546

Chi-square = 29.108 with 4 degrees of freedom. p = .000

Table 4

Crosstabulation Table

Hours Spent Viewing as a Child by Adult Viewing Philosophy

	ADULT VIEWING PHILOSOPHY						
HOURS AS A CHILD	Before chores	When have time	After chores	Nothing else to do	Feel guilty	Preselect programs	Row Total
Low	14	25	19	51	22	53	
ROW PCT	7.6	13.6	10.3	27.7	12.0	28.8	184
COL PCT	40.0	22.5	42.2	37.0	46.8	45.7	
Medium	14	69	24	73	22	53	
ROW PCT	56.5	27.1	9.4	28.6	8.6	20.8	255
COL PCT	40.0	62.2	53.3	52.9	46.8	45.7	
High	7	17	2	14	3	10	
ROW PCT	13.2	32.1	3.8	26.4	5.7	18.9	53
COL PCT	20.0	15.3	4.4	6.4	8.6	8.6	
COLUMN TOTAL	35	111	45	138	47	116	N = 492

Chi-square = 27.692 with 10 degrees of freedom. p = .002

Table 5

Crosstabulation Table

Interest Level as a Child by Hours Spent Viewing as an Adult

	HOURS SPENT VIEWING AS AN ADULT			
INTEREST AS A CHILD	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Low	85	15	1	
ROW PCT	84.2	14.9	1.0	101
COL PCT	20.6	13.4	4.3	
Medium	262	77	10	
ROW PCT	75.1	22.1	2.9	349
COL PCT	63.6	68.8	43.5	
High	65	20	12	
ROW PCT	67.0	20.6	12.4	97
COL PCT	15.8	17.9	52.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	412	112	23	N = 547

Chi-square = 23.286 with 4 degrees of freedom. p = .000

Table 6

Crosstabulation Table

Interest Level as a Child by Interest Level as an Adult

	INTEREST LEVEL AS AN ADULT			
INTEREST AS A CHILD	Low	Medium	High	Row Total
Low	76	23	1	
ROW PCT	76.0	23.0	1.0	100
COL PCT	24.6	10.9	4.0	
Medium	196	145	8	
ROW PCT	56.2	41.5	2.3	349
COL PCT	63.4	68.7	32.0	
High	37	43	16	
ROW PCT	38.5	44.8	16.7	96
COL PCT	12.0	20.4	64.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	309	211	25	N = 545

Chi-square = 57.537 with 4 degrees of freedom. p = .000

Table 7

Crosstabulation Table

Interest Level as a Child by Adult Viewing Philosophy

	ADULT VIEWING PHILOSOPHY						
INTEREST AS A CHILD	Before chores	When have time	After chores	Nothing else to do	Feel guilty	Preselect programs	Row Total
Low	4	12	10	20	8	30	
ROW PCT	4.8	14.3	11.9	23.8	9.5	35.7	84
COL PCT	11.4	10.8	22.2	14.5	16.7	26.5	
Medium	19	75	26	103	32	68	
ROW PCT	5.9	23.2	8.0	31.9	9.9	21.1	323
COL PCT	54.3	61.6	57.8	74.6	66.7	60.2	
High	12	24	9	15	8	15	
ROW PCT	14.5	28.9	10.8	18.1	9.6	18.1	83
COL PCT	34.3	21.6	20.0	10.9	16.7	13.3	
COLUMN TOTAL	35	111	45	138	48	113	N = 490

Chi-square = 25.523 with 10 degrees of freedom. p = .004

Table 8

Crosstabulation Table

Childhood Viewing Companions by Adult Viewing Companions

	ADULT COMPANIONS		
CHILDHOOD COMPANIONS	Alone	Friends	Row Total
Alone	25	61	
ROW PCT	29.1	70.9	86
COL PCT	16.2	16.1	
Friends	105	225	
ROW PCT	31.8	60.2	330
COL PCT	68.2	59.2	
Parents	24	94	
ROW PCT	20.3	79.7	118
COL PCT	15.6	24.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	154	380	N = 534

Chi-square = 5.584 with 2 degrees of freedom. p = .061

Table 9

Contingency Analysis

Type Viewed as a Child by Type Viewed as an Adult

	SITCOMS				DRAMAS		
	Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total		Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total
Child	492	65	557	Child	183	374	557
Adult	271	286	557	Adult	227	370	557
COLUMN TOTAL	763	351	N = 1114	COLUMN TOTAL	410	704	N = 1114
Chi square = 203.160 with 1 degree of freedom.				Chi-square = 7.472 with 1 degree of freedom			
p = .000				p = .006			

Table 9 cont.

Contingency Analysis

Type Viewed as a Child by Type Viewed as an Adult

	POLICE AND DETECTIVE SHOWS				MOVIES		
	Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total		Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total
Child	369	188	557	Child	312	245	557
Adult	187	370	557	Adult	333	224	557
COLUMN TOTAL	556	558	N = 1114	COLUMN TOTAL	645	469	N = 1114

Chi-square = 118.938 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .000

Chi-square = 1.624 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .203

Table 9 cont.

Contingency Analysis

Type Viewed as a Child by Type Viewed as an Adult

	WESTERN				TALK SHOWS		
	Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total		Watched	Did Not Watch	Row Total
Child	311	246	557	Child	94	463	557
Adult	104	453	557	Adult	92	465	557
COLUMN TOTAL	415	699	N = 1114	COLUMN TOTAL	186	928	N = 1114
Chi-square = 164.551 with 1 degree of freedom.				Chi-square = .026 with 1 degree of freedom.			
p = .000				p = .872			

Table 9 cont.

Contingency Analysis

Type Viewed as a Child by Type Viewed as an Adult

	GAMESHOWS				NEWS		
	Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total		Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total
Child	310	247	557	Child	184	373	557
Adult	60	497	557	Adult	322	235	557
COLUMN TOTAL	730	744	N = 1114	COLUMN TOTAL	506	608	N = 1114

Chi-square = 252.924 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .000

Chi-square = 68.959 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .000

Table 9 cont.

Contingency Analysis

Type Viewed as a Child by Type Viewed as an Adult

	SOAP OPERAS				PUBLIC TELEVISION		
	Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total		Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total
Child	103	454	557	Child	171	386	557
Adult	182	375	557	Adult	141	416	557
COLUMN TOTAL	285	829	N = 1114	COLUMN TOTAL	312	802	N = 1114

Chi-square = 29.427 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .000

Chi-square = 4.007 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .045

Table 9 cont.

Contingency Analysis

Type Viewed as a Child by Type Viewed as an Adult

	SPORTS				VARIETY		
	Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total		Watched	Did not Watch	Row Total
Child	261	296	557	Child	232	325	557
Adult	278	279	557	Adult	86	471	557
COLUMN TOTAL	539	575	N = 1114	COLUMN TOTAL	318	796	N = 1114

Chi-square = 1.039 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .308

Chi-square = 93.810 with 1 degree of freedom.

p = .000